

REMARKS

Claims 4-8 are currently pending. Claims 1-3 are cancelled.

I. The Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112 and 35 U.S.C. §101

Claims 4-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite.

Claims 5 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 as reciting a “use”.

Claims 5 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite.

Claim 4 has been amended for clarity to state that the “the electrolyte thin film comprises alternating layers of a polyanionic thin film and a polycationic thin”

Claims 5 and 6 have been amended for clarity to state that “the immobilization support is capable of immobilizing”

For the above reasons, it is respectfully submitted that Applicants’ claims are clear and definite and it is requested that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112 be reconsidered and withdrawn. Applicants also respectfully submit that claims 5 and 6 contain statutory subject matter.

II. The Rejection Based on Kornguth et al.

Claims 4-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Kornguth et al (US 5,629,213).

Applicants respectfully submit that the present invention is not anticipated by or obvious over the disclosures of Kornguth et al and request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw this rejection in view of the following remarks.

The immobilization support of the present invention comprises an electrolyte thin film which consists of alternating layers formed by alternately layering a polycationic thin film and a polyanionic thin film so that the uppermost layer is the polycationic thin film. In order to layer the polyanionic thin film and the polycationic thin film alternately so that the uppermost layer is the polycationic thin film, the alternating layers have at least three thin films, i.e., a polycationic thin film/a polyanionic thin film/a polycationic thin film (as the uppermost layer) formed in this order on the support. In other words, in order to layer the polyanionic thin film and the polycationic thin film alternately, in case the alternating layers have three thin films, one polycationic thin film is firstly layered on the support, one polyanionic thin film is subsequently layered on the polycationic thin film, and another polycationic thin film is further layered on the polyanionic thin film as the uppermost layer. In case the alternating layers have more than three thin films, for example four thin films, one polyanionic thin film is firstly layered on the support, one polycationic thin film is subsequently layered on the polyanionic thin film, and another polyanionic thin film is further layered on the polycationic thin film, and another polycationic thin film is further layered on the former polyanionic thin film as the uppermost layer. In contrast, Kornguth et al. do not disclose an electrolyte thin film which consists of alternating layers. Kornguth et al. teach that a biosensor comprises an ultrathin organic layer comprising a

Amendment
Application No. 10/527,805
Attorney Docket No. 052254

polyanionic material adsorbed upon a metallic film, a polycationic polylysine layer bound to that polyanionic layer, and an outer layer bound to that polylysine layer. The biosensor of Kornguth et al. has only one polyanionic layer and one polycationic layer, so that the polyanionic layer and the polycationic layer are not alternately layered.

Additionally, since Kornguth et al. teach that the biosensor comprises the ultrathin organic film, one of ordinary skill in the art would not be motivated or have any reason to add further layers to form alternating layers having larger thickness.

For the above reasons, it is respectfully submitted that the subject matter of claims 4-8 is neither taught by nor made obvious from the disclosures of Kornguth et al and it is requested that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102 be reconsidered and withdrawn.

III. Conclusion

In view of the above, Applicants respectfully submit that their claimed invention is allowable and ask that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112, the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §101 and the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102 be reconsidered and withdrawn. Applicants respectfully submit that this case is in condition for allowance and allowance is respectfully solicited.

If any points remain at issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the local exchange number listed below.

Amendment
Application No. 10/527,805
Attorney Docket No. 052254

If this paper is not timely filed, Applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. The fees for such an extension or any other fees that may be due with respect to this paper may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-2866.

Respectfully submitted,
WESTERMAN, HATTORI, DANIELS & ADRIAN, LLP



Lee C. Wright
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 41,441
Telephone: (202) 822-1100
Facsimile: (202) 822-1111

LCW/af